2/5/71

Dear Harold,

I was quite glad to get your recent mailings today. I've not much time now, but there are some things on which I8d like to make immediate response.

Before I forget, I want to let you know that I'll be going on radio next month for two separate hour long interviews, re my work. The campus station, WXPN, which broadcasts over about a 20 mile radius and at which I have many friends, asked me to do it. Will be very careful about what I say, will stick to my own stuff, and have already told the interviewer what not to even touch on.

Your words on my research project are very encouraging. I did not really know what reaction to expect. I am so glad that you recognize that I have no intention of public use--further, I promise you I'll not use this in public, and will tell my prof this must be secret. The things you mentionedwhich Lil has already typed up sound very helpful for both of us. They will surely aid me and I imagine they could save you much time.

Personal discussion will be important. I can call you sometimes, and perhaps we can meet personally again before I write the final paper.

You suggest I read "S and S" first. There are 3 S's so this is a little confusing. I have sorenson and Saling in paperback and will soon get Schles. I cannot afford the hardbacks. Also have the Wise book, a White book, the Hilsman, plus the other Sorenson re the peaceful Kennedy revolution.

Thus far I've read only Sorenson and was not impressed. The most I got out of it was the general mood of the administration, my desire for details hardly satisfied. The domestic stuff was OK I suppose, but I was appalled by his stuff on foreign policy. The book impressed me as incoherent, for the organization was bad. It mixed generalizations about the administration with narratives so much that I began to loose the chronology (though not always). As for the foreign stuff, he admits that it isn't all that reliable for much was secondhand or overheard, and the best, as he puts it, must be kept secret. For Vietnam, he does not even mention the troop withdrawal, which was announced publicaclly by Rusk, before and after assass. Do not mistake this criticism as saying that I found nothing of value in Sorenson.

Your words on CIA and Diem coup are good and conform with my later thoughts, advanced by my continued research. It certainly does appear that CIA did have a hand in the coup. In fact, Sorenson hints at this by repeating that the US did nothing to prevent threats of which it knew.

Now two questions remain. First, JFK ordered the withdrawal before the coup. Would his plans have been altered by that, esp. in light of the alleged step-up of Cong activity after the coup? I've still a lot more reading on this. Second, were any others taken out after the first 220 of the 1000? (My figures come from State Dept. documents compiled in a single volume by year.) I've not read enough yet to know just when LBJ started sending more troops in, although I know the "re-evaluation" began right after the assass.

Thanks for commenting on Krock.

I accept your caution on the Roche NYT article. However, I'm not at all clear on your joy over the Hilsman material. When I got his book, I rejoyced thinking I had something really important--someone in a position to know telling it all. I was certainly impressed with the fact that he left over his alleged conviction that LBJ was taking the military approach. A friend of mine knows Hilsman and said he was a fine man, a good liberal. It is his book that I am reading now. Please fill me in on him. Can I trust what he says? For it certainly seems important, esp. his stuff on CIA and extensive coverage of Vietnam.

I'Ll get the panel report copies to you soon as I pick up my copy at home tomorrow. I do 't have a postage scale, but I seem to member putting 12¢ on letters which were heavy. Unless they could cost 18¢, in which case I am sorry if I put you out.

Again, thanks for writing.

Best,

Harold

cc Dick